APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,759	06/08/2000	ALBHY GALUTEN	9389/1F215-U	4604 ·

7590   01/03/2003

DARBY & DARBY
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY   10022-7513

EXAMINER
CLINTON, GREGORY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4,6* .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1.   Claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

2.   The Examiner notes that although Claim 16 depends on claim 12, it appears that the

claim may have been intended to depend on claim 13. The applicant is invited to review the

claims and determine whether claim 16's dependency is correct. The Examiner will interpret the

claim's dependency as written for the purposes of prior art rejection.

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1 – 5, 9 – 11, 13, 14, and 17 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Lowell, U.S. Patent No. 6,012,086.

5.   Lowell was cited in the applicants' IDS filed July 13, 2000 (Paper No. 4) as well as in the

International Search Report mailed May 10, 2000.

6.   As to claim 1, Lowell teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a handle at a

first location where the handle identifies a media object; transmitting the handle from the first

location to a second location through the network; and rendering the identified media object at the second location in accordance with the handle (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

7.   As to claim 9, Lowell teaches rendering a media object at a first location; generating a handle at the first location where the handle identifies the media object and identifies at least one value-chain participant; transmitting the handle to at least one second location over the network; and rendering the media object at the second location using the handle (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

8.   As to claim 13, Lowell teaches generating a handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object; transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the network; and rendering the identified media object at the second location such that rendition of the media object at the second location is synchronized with the rendition of the media object at the first location (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

9.   As to claim 17, Lowell teaches generating a handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object and a reference to a technical-support-source; transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the network; optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion; and establishing access to the technical support source according to the reference in the handle (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

10.   As to claim 19, Lowell teaches generating a handle at a first location where the handle

identifies a media object and a reference to a technical-support-source; transmitting the handle

from the first location to a second location through the network; at the second location, retrieving

from the server the media object identified by the handle; optionally, displaying the media object

at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing

audio corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object contains

an audio portion; establishing access to the technical support source according to the reference in

the handle; and optionally, downloading technical-support-information from the technical

support source at the second location (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

11.   As to claim 2, Lowell teaches obtaining an identifier for the media object; obtaining an

identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object; and combining the identifiers

to form the handle (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

12.   As to claim 3, Lowell teaches that the transmitting step operates to transmit TV/video

links (col. 9, lines 24 – 25.)

13.   As to claims 4, 11, and 14, Lowell teaches the steps of transmitting the handle from the

second location to a server; at the second location, receiving from the server the media object

identified by the handle; optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when the

media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to media

object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion (col. 1, line 59 –

col. 2, line 20.)

14.   As to claim 5, Lowell teaches optionally, displaying the media object at the second

location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio

corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object contains an

audio portion (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

15.   As to claim 10, Lowell teaches obtaining permission to render the media object at the

second location from the at least one value-chain participant; and rendering the media object at

the second location in accordance with such permission.

16.   As to claims 18 and 20, Lowell teaches updating the technical-support-information

previously downloaded from the technical-support-source (col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 20.)

17.   Claims 1 and 4 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the

HTML 4.0 Specification (hereinafter referred to as HTML 4.0.)

18.   As to claim 1, HTML 4.0 teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a handle

at a first location where the handle identifies a media object (section 2.2); transmitting the handle

from the first location to a second location through the network (section 2.2); and rendering the

identified media object at the second location in accordance with the handle (section 13.3.1.)

19.   As to claim 3, HTML 4.0 teaches that the transmitting step transmits e-mail (section 14.6.)

20.   As to claim 4, HTML 4.0 teaches the steps of transmitting the handle from the second location to a server; at the second location, receiving from the server the media object identified by the handle (section 13); optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to media object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion (section 13.)

21.   As to claim 5, HTML 4.0 teaches optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion (section 13.)

22.   As to claim 6, HTML 4.0 teaches an object-id specifying the location of the media object (section 13.1.)

23.   As to claim 7, HTML 4.0 teaches that the handle includes a set of terms that govern the rendition of the media object (sections 14.2.2, 13.3.)

24.   As to claim 8, HTML 4.0 teaches that the handle includes a reference to a set of terms

that governs the rendition of the media object (section 14.3.)

25.   Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 11 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bayrakeri, U.S. Patent No. 6,185,602.

26.   As to claims 1 and 9, Bayrakeri teaches the invention as claimed, including rendering a

media object at a first location (col. 3, lines 57 – 59); generating a handle at the first location

where the handle identifies the media object and identifies at least one value-chain participant

(col. 3, lines 60 – 61); transmitting the handle to at least one second location over the network

(col. 3, lines 60 – 61); and rendering the media object at the second location using the handle

(col. 3, lines 61 – 65.)

27.   As to claim 13, Bayrakeri teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a handle

at a first location where the handle identifies a media object (col. 3, lines 60 – 61); transmitting

the handle from the first location to a second location through the network (col. 3, lines 60 – 61);

and rendering the identified media object at the second location such that rendition of the media

object at the second location is synchronized with the rendition of the media object at the first

location (col. 3, lines 61 – 64; col. 4, lines 50 – 54.)

28.   As to claims 4, 11, and 14, Bayrakeri teaches transmitting the handle from the second

location to a server (col. 3, lines 65 – 66); at the second location, receiving from the server the

media object identified by the handle (col. 3, lines 66 – 67); optionally, displaying the media

object at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally,

producing audio corresponding to media object at the second location when the media object

contains an audio portion (col. 3, lines 61 – 65.)

29.   As to claims 6, 12, and 15, Bayrakeri teaches a user-id associated with the user of the

media object (col. 3, line 67 – col. 4, line 1; col. 4, lines 52 – 54.)

30.   Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koppolu et

al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103824.

31.   As to claim 17, Koppolu teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a handle

at a first location where the handle identifies a media object and a reference to a technical-

support-source (paragraphs 453); transmitting the handle from the first location to a second

location through the network (inherent: the handles are embedded in web pages which are

transmitted from the first location, a server, to the second location, a client); optionally,

displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a visual

portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second location

when the media object contains an audio portion; and establishing access to the technical support

source according to the reference in the handle (paragraph 453.)

32.   As to claim 19, Koppolu teaches generating a handle at a first location where the handle

identifies a media object and a reference to a technical-support-source (paragraphs 453);

transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the network (inherent:

the handles are embedded in web pages which are transmitted from the first location, a server, to

the second location, a client); transmitting the handle from the second location to a server on the

network; at the second location, receiving from the server the media object identified by the

handle (paragraphs 476, 477); optionally, displaying the media object at the second location

when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding

to the media object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion; and

establishing access to the technical support source according to the reference in the handle

(paragraph 453.)

33.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

34.   Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowell

as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Stefik et al., U.S. Patent No.

5,629,980.

35.   As to claim 2, Lowell teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 1. However,

Lowell does not teach obtaining an identifier for the media object; obtaining an identifier for

each participant of a value-chain for the media object; and combining the identifiers to form the

handle.

36.   Stefik teaches obtaining an identifier for the media object (col. 9, lines 55 – 56);

obtaining an identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object (cols 10 – 11,

Table 1); and combining the identifiers to form the handle (col. 9, lines 55 – 56; cols. 10 – 11,

Table 1.)

37.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Stefik with Lowell because Stefik's value chain identifiers

enable the method to properly reimburse the correct content owners for use of the content, thus

enhancing the method's usefulness in the eyes of content holders (Stefik, col. 3, lines 46 – 47.)

38.   As to claim 10, Lowell teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 9.

However, Lowell does not teach obtaining permission to render the media object at the second

location from the at least one value-chain participant; and rendering the media object at the

second location in accordance with such permission.

39.   Stefik teaches obtaining permission to render the media object at the second location

from the at least one value-chain participant (col. 31, lines 26 – 27); and rendering the media

object at the second location in accordance with such permission (col. 36, lines 56 – 60.)

40.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Stefik with Lowell because Stefik's permissions enable

the method to reduce piracy and protect content holders' rights.

41.   Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HTML 4.0 as

applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Stefik et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980.

42.   As to claim 2, HTML 4.0 teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 1.

However, HTML 4.0 does not teach obtaining an identifier for the media object; obtaining an

identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object; and combining the identifiers

to form the handle.

43.   Stefik teaches obtaining an identifier for the media object (col. 9, lines 55 – 56);

obtaining an identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object (cols 10 – 11,

Table 1); and combining the identifiers to form the handle (col. 9, lines 55 – 56; cols. 10 – 11,

Table 1.)

44.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Stefik with HTML 4.0 because Stefik's value chain

identifiers enable the method to properly reimburse the correct content owners for use of the

content, thus enhancing the method's usefulness in the eyes of content holders (Stefik, col. 3,

lines 46 – 47.)

45.   Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bayrakeri as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Stefik et al., U.S. Patent No.

5,629,980.

46.   As to claim 2, Bayrakeri teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 1.

However, Bayrakeri does not teach obtaining an identifier for the media object; obtaining an

identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object; and combining the identifiers

to form the handle.

47.   Stefik teaches obtaining an identifier for the media object (col. 9, lines 55 – 56);

obtaining an identifier for each participant of a value-chain for the media object (cols 10 – 11,

Table 1); and combining the identifiers to form the handle (col. 9, lines 55 – 56; cols. 10 – 11,

Table 1.)

48.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Stefik with Bayrakeri because Stefik's value chain

identifiers enable the method to properly reimburse the correct content owners for use of the

content, thus enhancing the method's usefulness in the eyes of content holders (Stefik, col. 3,

lines 46 – 47.)

49.   As to claim 10, Bayrakeri teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 9.

However, Bayrakeri does not teach obtaining permission to render the media object at the second

location from the at least one value-chain participant; and rendering the media object at the

second location in accordance with such permission.

50.   Stefik teaches obtaining permission to render the media object at the second location

from the at least one value-chain participant (col. 31, lines 26 – 27); and rendering the media

object at the second location in accordance with such permission (col. 36, lines 56 – 60.)

51.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Stefik with Bayrakeri because Stefik's permissions enable

the method to reduce piracy and protect content holders' rights.

52.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayrakeri as

applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Borella et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,182,125.

53.   As to claim 16, Bayrakeri teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 12.

However, Bayrakeri does not teach computing a transport time as the difference between a

current absolute time and an absolute time when the handle was transmitted or at the second

location, rendering the media object corresponding a temporal location incremented by the

transport time.

54.   Borella teaches computing a transport time as the difference between a current absolute

time and an absolute time when the handle was transmitted (col. 5, lines 36 – 39.)

55.   Although Borella does not teach the rendering step, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Borella and Bayrakeri and further to modify

the combination to include a rendering step because Borella suggests that the delay may be used

as a determining factor in how to treat the content (Borella, col. 5, lines 42 – 44)

56.   Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Koppolu as applied to claims 17 and 19 above, and further in view of Chiles et al., U.S. Patent

No. 6,167,567.

57.   As to claims 18 and 20, Koppolu teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claims

17 and 19. However, Koppolu fails to teach updating the technical-support-information

previously downloaded from the technical-support-source.

58.   Chiles teaches updating software previously downloaded from a software source (col. 3,

lines 29 – 31.)

59.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Chiles with Koppolu because Chiles' updating enhances

the method's functionality by providing the most up-to-date information available (Chiles, lines

18 – 24.)

60.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gregory L. Clinton whose telephone number is 703-305-3179.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai T. An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular

communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Gregory Clinton
December 16, 2002